

## The New Nationalism

The Scotching of new nationalism is one of the undeniable results of the election. In a speech at Indianapolis, October 18, Mr. Bryan spoke of new nationalism as follows:

The senate to be elected will probably have to deal with new nationalism, and you ought to know what new nationalism means. You will not feel offended if I assume that some of you may not know, because I did not find out until about a week ago, and I make it my business to keep posted on what is going on politically. But I was so rejoiced to find Mr. Roosevelt endorsing several democratic reforms that I overlooked some of the things that he said at Osawatimie. I had wondered why he called it new nationalism.—It seemed to me that old democracy would really be a better description, because the things that attracted attention were things for which democracy has been fighting.

But a little more than a week ago I saw an extract from his own magazine, the Outlook, and in this extract, Mr. Roosevelt himself had condensed his new nationalism into four sentences. When I read these sentences I was amazed; I was astounded. And you will be both amazed and astounded when you find out what new nationalism means.

Before I read the three sentences that I desire to comment on I will read the fourth, which is not so important. He says:

"New nationalism demands of the judiciary that it shall be interested primarily in human welfare, rather than in property."

Well, there is nothing new about that demand. It is now more than sixty years since Lincoln coined the phrase which is the most apt expression of this doctrine; he said that when the dollar and the man come into conflict he was for the man before the dollar. The democratic party has been preaching that doctrine for years; that is all that fourth sentence means. You do not have to advocate new nationalism to get that old doctrine. But let me give you the three sentences which contain the essence of new nationalism.

"First, the new nationalism is impatient of the utter confusion that results from local legislatures attempting to treat national issues as local issues."

What does that mean? It means that new nationalism wants to deprive the states of some of the powers that they now have, and transfer those powers to Washington. One of the things desired is the national incorporation of railroads. Mr. Roosevelt has recommended it in one of his messages, and one of the reasons he gave was that it would relieve the railroads some annoyance by local legislatures. President Taft is now preparing, through his attorney general, a bill that provides for the national incorporation of corporations engaged in interstate commerce; and why? Because state restrictions are objected to by these great corporations. The first step toward the new nationalism is to concentrate power in Washington, to increase the proportional power of the federal government and decrease the proportional importance of the states. It means that when you want to deal with a railroad, or with the big corporations that come into your state, instead of doing so by your state legislatures, you must wait until Washington acts. And remember that when you wait on Washington you wait on the senate as well as the house; and that senate now has so many representatives of predatory interests in it, that it is the bulwark of the exploiting interests of the country. Are you willing to surrender the power you now have, and put your government farther away from you? The democratic party says that federal remedies should be added to the state remedies, not substituted for state remedies. The democratic party says, let the state exercise the power it has, and let the nation exercise the power it has. When both state and nation have acted you will not have any more regulation than you need. Let me illustrate this. The home, the church and the school join in developing the character of our boys. What mother would be willing to strike down either the home, the school or the church, and leave it all to the other two? And yet, my friends, the advocates of new nationalism would diminish the power of the people of a state to protect their own rights, and make it more difficult to secure redress by removing the seat of power to Washington. That is the first step in the new nationalism—the concentration of power in Washington. And the second:

"The new nationalism is still more impatient

of the impotence which springs from the over-division of government powers."

You are not only to concentrate power in Washington, but you are to consolidate the powers of government. Instead of having a division of powers such as the fathers thought necessary for the protection of liberty you are to have a rising executive and a diminishing court and legislature. That is step number two. And what is the third step? It naturally follows:

"Third, the new nationalism regards the executive power as the steward of the public welfare."

There you have it, my friends. First, put everything in Washington. Second, put everything in the hands of the president. And then he is to stand as a sort of earthly father and take care of us. How do you like new nationalism, my friends, when you find out what it is? This is the doctrine from which the world has been moving. It has cost the lives of millions of patriots to get away from this doctrine. God forbid that we should go back to it?

I doubt if there is another man in the United States who would desire to exercise the power that Mr. Roosevelt wants to vest in a president. I do not believe there is another. Even if you are willing to trust him with this power I beg you to remember that he is only human and may die; you must trust another man to exercise it when he is dead. You cannot judge a monarchy by a good king. There have been good kings, but there never was a good monarchy. The doctrine is bad, and never since the days of Alexander Hamilton has such a doctrine been promulgated in the United States by a prominent man as is now advanced in the name of new nationalism. You need John Kern there to vote against these initial steps toward a one man power. You need John Kern there to vote against national incorporation of railroads. You need John Kern there to vote against the national incorporation of great corporations that are now hard to deal with, and will be stronger still if they can rid themselves of all state restrictions and stalk, uncontrolled, across this land.

And then there is the question of a free speech and a free press. Is it a part of new nationalism to commence libel suits in Washington, and drag editors across the continent to defend themselves for criticism of an administration? Is that to be considered a part of new nationalism? If we are to increase the importance of the federal government by concentrating all power there; if we are then to increase the powers of the presidential office by consolidating all power there, and then be required to reverence it as the guardian and steward of the people—if that is to be the doctrine then you need not be surprised if you are told that you must not frown when you look up towards this source of power; that if you do frown you must not speak; that if you speak, they can take you from your home and make you defend yourself at such a distance from your home that even a victory will be bankruptcy for you and your children.

While it would not be fair to say that opposition to new nationalism accounts entirely for Mr. Roosevelt's failure to elect the men whom he supported, still it is evident that the doctrine which he presented has not taken hold upon the hearts of the people, and why should it? The people are democratic at heart, and the doctrine of local self-government is the democratic doctrine. People are not apt to surrender political power when once they have been permitted to enjoy it; and it is a surrender of political power to turn over to the national government work that can be better done by state legislatures. It is fortunate for the country that Mr. Roosevelt brought out his Hamiltonian creed at the time he did, for had he held it in reserve, he might put it forth now and insist upon its popularity being tested at the polls. As it is, he will probably recognize that the people are wedded to the state as well as to the nation; if he does not recognize it, the multitude do.

### A GOOD BEGINNING

Senator-elect Wilkinson of Louisiana makes a good beginning when he announces: "I am a democrat and will stand with the democratic party on the tariff question." This is encouraging; Louisiana has at times been a little weak on tariff reform and the party will welcome a senator who will stand with the democrats. Here's to Senator Wilkinson.

## Practical Tariff Talks

A Commoner reader asks for some information respecting the tariff schedule on paints. There are a number of paragraphs in the oils and chemicals schedule which have a bearing on the price of the common paint of commerce. The paint one sees upon a house, for instance, is made up of a variety of ingredients. There is the pigment, the coloring material; the liquid, which when still liquid is referred to in the trade parlance as the vehicle, and which when dry becomes the binder; the thinner or solvent, the drier and the like. The pigments are of various origins. Some of them are earths, some are sulphides, some are iron oxides. Each bears a separate rating in the tariff schedule, as incidentally referred to in a previous article, and each is very liberally protected, despite the fact that ample testimony was presented to congress to show that these were as a rule too high or else unnecessary. Turpentine is usually employed as a solvent, linseed oil as the vehicle, while the driers are usually compounds of lead and manganese. White lead and red lead are basic compounds of many paints.

The white lead trust is a well known and powerful figure in commerce. It has been able to spring into being and to make millions for its owners very largely because of the tariff protection afforded it. This tariff protection has been for years about 46 per cent. The delusive reduction made in the present tariff law leaves it at 40 per cent. As the importation was less than \$40,000 a year, which is plain proof of the prohibitive character of the old tariff, it is easy to discern that the 6 per cent cut, which is exactly one-eighth of a cent a pound, will not affect the power of the trust to fix prices in the home market. This is not the only instance in this schedule where the interests of the trust were carefully looked after by the tariff-makers. The high duties of past years and the high prices of lead paints drove a great many manufacturers to the use of cheaper materials, such as barytes.

Barytes is a white, usually translucent product of stone, and used as a white pigment. It does not possess body enough of its own to form a substitute for white lead, but mixed with the latter as an adulterant it accomplishes the beneficent purpose of necessitating a smaller quantity of the latter. It takes color stains uniformly, and experiment has shown it possesses a permanent value in the industry. For one thing, when used in connection with aniline, it enables a considerable surface to be covered by an unusually small quantity of paint. It is also used as the base for conveying many original coloring matters used in paint. Its use meant and still means cheaper paints than those where white lead is the base. These cheap paints have become serious competitors with those made from the products of the lead trust, and in order to protect the trust by increasing the cost of making these cheaper paints the Payne-Aldrich law doubled the duty on crude barytes, increasing it from 20 to 40 per cent.

In paint-making several ingredients are combined to form the white base from which coloring tints are made. To get these tints the makers use dry colors made from a combination of chemicals or prepared from ores and clays dried from the mine. Each of these ingredients bears a duty of some kind, and in each instance the duty is excessive, intended either to protect the manufacturer or the mine-owner. The paint making business is usually divided into several branches, each of which furnishes some one or more ingredients, usually prepared for mixing, and the final mixing of oil and color is a division in itself. The tariff has been adjusted with such a keen eye for the manufacturer and with such disregard for the interests of the consumer, in such a way that several trusts exact tributes from every paint-maker, with the final result that today the man who buys and uses the paint pays 100 per cent more than he did ten years ago—and then he usually got a better article for his money than he will for double that figure today. C. Q. D.

The American Homestead, a monthly farm journal of national scope, will be sent to all Commoner subscribers, without additional cost, who renew their subscriptions during the month of January when this notice is mentioned.